United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/19/NOR/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
21 January 2014

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Nineteenth session
28 April – 9 May 2014

Summary prepared by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with paragraph 15 (b) of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21

Norway*

The present report is a summary of 12 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review. It follows the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council in its decision 17/119. It does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), nor any judgement or determination in relation to specific claims. The information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes and, to the extent possible, the original texts have not been altered. As provided for in Resolution 16/21 of the Human Rights Council, where appropriate, a separate section is provided for contributions by the national human rights institution of the State under review that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles. The full texts of all submissions received are available on the OHCHR website. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the periodicity of the review and developments during that period.

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

GE.14-10415

1410415

Please recycle

I. Information provided by stakeholders

A. Background and framework

1. Scope of international obligations

1. The Norwegian Children and Youth Council (LNU) welcome the ratification of the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights and Dignity of persons with Disabilities (CRPD), in accordance with recommendation 105.2 made during the review of Norway on 2 December 2009 (Review in 2009).[2] It recommended that Norway sign and ratify the Optional Protocol to CRPD, in accordance with recommendation 106.5 made at the Review in 2009.[3]

2. Norwegian Centre for Human Rights (NI) expressed disappointment with the two interpretative declarations made to articles 12 and 14 of CRPD, in light of the well-documented excessive use of coercion in the mental health care system.[4] WSO recommended the withdrawal of these declarations.[5]

3. LNU, Norwegian NGO-forum for Human Rights (NGOFHR) and Save the Children – Norway (SCN) recommended that Norway sign and ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a Communications Procedure.[6]

4. NGOFHR recommended that Norway sign and ratify the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights. [7] LNU made a similar recommendation, having noted that this Protocol was adopted by consensus and with the vote of Norway at the United Nations General Assembly.[8]

5. NGOFHR recommended that Norway withdraw reservations to Article 10 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).[9]

6. NI recommended that Norway sign and ratify the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.[10]

2. Constitutional and legislative framework

7. NI stated that Parliament initiated a process of legislative amendments that aims to incorporate central provisions of international human rights norms into the Constitution. However, scepticism was voiced towards the incorporation of economic, social and cultural rights. It recommended that Norway strengthen constitutional protection of human rights taking into full account the interdependence and indivisibility of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights.[11]

8. The Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud (Ombud) recommended that Norway protect against discrimination by incorporating in its Constitution principles of equality in accordance with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the International Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD), and the CRPD.[12]

9. NI stated that the Human Rights Act of 1999 enjoys statutory precedence over regular legislation and includes five human rights treaties: European Convention on Human Rights, ICCPR, International Convention on Economic Social and Cultural Rights, Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and CEDAW. However, other central human rights instruments are either incorporated as ordinary legislation (ICERD) or are not incorporated into legation (CAT and CRPD). It recommended that Norway evaluate the consequences of giving ICERD, CAT and CRPD a weaker legal status.[13] We Shall Overcome (WSO) recommended the incorporation of CRPD in the Human Rights Act.[14]

The Ombud made a similar recommendation and also recommended the incorporation of ICERD in the Human Rights Act.[15]

10. Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe - Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (OSCE-ODIHR) referred to the election legislation and recalled its opinion that Norwegian citizens were left without an option of timely appeal to independent courts in matters relating to the exercise of the right to choose their local government, their national Parliament and, indirectly, their national government. Similarly, the courts did not play a role in the final validation of elections. In order to meet international standards and commitments, Norway should include the judiciary in the process of electoral dispute resolution. It should provide for final appeal on all election-related complaints to a court. Furthermore, the final validation of the election should include a possibility of appeal to a high judicial body, such as the Supreme Court. This solution would entail the need for a constitutional amendment.[16]

11. SCN stated that the Child Welfare Act of 1992 stipulates that the best interest of the child shall be the primary consideration of the Child Welfare Services. However, the Act lacks a corresponding right of the child to receive assistance from the Child Welfare Services. SCN recommended the amendment of the Act to provide children with timely and appropriate assistance.[17]

3. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures

12. The Ombud recommended that Norway establish a new national human rights institution (NHRI) with an A-status.[18] NGOFHR stated that it did not support the proposal for the creation of a new NHRI that was presented in June 2013. It recommended the establishment of a new NHRI in full compliance with the Paris Principles and with sufficient resources to be effective.[19]

13. NI noted that the Parliamentary Ombudsman was appointed as National Preventative Mechanism (NPM) and as a monitoring body to visit all places of detention. It recommended that the NPM is evaluated in accordance with the requirements of OP-CAT.[20]

14. The Ombud stated that the process before the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Tribunal was intended to provide an easier alternative when compared to the filing of discrimination cases before the courts. However, the Tribunal lacked the authority to order financial sanctions and compensations for damages.[21]

15. Council of Europe – Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (CoE-AC) encouraged Norway to increase public awareness about the work of the Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombudsperson's office; to provide the additional resources to the office; to support persons belonging to national minorities who wished to obtain legal aid in order to exercise their rights in alleged cases of discrimination; and to consider the request to expand the mandate to allow for the granting of legal aid.[22]

16. The Future in Our hands Norway (FIOH) stated that Norway should develop effective mechanisms to ensure that corporations respect the findings of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) National Contact Point (NCP) and that they act on the recommendations that have been made.[23]

17. NGOFHR stated that there were limited consultations with civil society in relation to the ratification of international human rights instruments. It called on Norway to strengthen consultations with civil society.[24]

18. NI recommended that Norway strengthen the implementation of human rights by developing a new national plan of action and enhancing procedures for the effective follow-up of recommendations made by international monitoring mechanisms.[25] NGOFHR recommended that Norway adopt a comprehensive plan of action for human rights through a transparent, predictable, inclusive and participatory process, with a five years cycle.[26]

19. NI recommended that Norway develop a national action plan for human rights education that consists of a thorough needs assessment and programmes for human rights education at all levels, with the particular focus on staff of the law enforcement agencies as well as personnel of institutions responsible for care, treatment and custody of persons.[27]

20. NI expressed concern over the increased incidences of hate speech and other expressions of non-tolerance by certain individuals and groups, including representatives of political parties. It recommended that Norway develop a comprehensive strategy to combat hate speech, including measures to effectively investigate and prosecute such offences.[28]

B. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Equality and non-discrimination

21. The Ombud stated that the promotion of equality was given low propriety. Public authorities at all levels fail to sufficiently mainstream gender equality as a matter of routine, in their work as employers, service providers, appropriators of funds, policy-makers and as enactors of rules, regulations and ordinances.[29] The Ombud recommended that Norway should take more action to fully realise the potential of its equality policy, by following-up on the recommendations of the Equality Commission.[30] It also recommended the development of a strategic plan to end impunity for perpetrators of violence related to inequality and discrimination.[31]

22. NI stated that more than half of the immigrant population has experienced discrimination in one or more of the following areas – labour market, housing sector, education and healthcare. In 2012, the unemployment rate was three times higher amongst persons with immigrant background. A 2012 survey revealed that the likelihood of being called for a job interview was reduced by 25 percent if the applicant had a foreign name. Also, more than 20 percent of the participants indicated that they were refused property, either to rent or buy, because of their immigrant background. NI recommended that Norway adopt vigorous measures to combat all forms of discrimination against persons with immigrant background.[32]

23. Council of Europe - European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (CoE-ECRI) stated that the duty on public authorities and employers to promote equality remained general in nature and no steps had been taken to attach to it specific duties, in accordance with its earlier recommendation.[33] CoE-ECRI considered that its recommendation in its report[34] on the Ombud enforcing the duty of public authorities and private employers promoting equality and eliminating racial discrimination has not been implemented.[35]

24. CoE-ECRI concluded that its recommendations that the Norway increase the availability and use of professional interpretation in the health sector, as well as in the legal system, having noted the discrimination endured by persons of immigrant backgrounds, were not fully implemented.[36]

25. CoE-ECRI concluded that its recommendations in its report[37] that the Norway take steps to address racial profiling, notably in stop and search operations carried out by police and customs and immigration officials; and that Norway carry out in-depth research on racial profiling and monitor police activities in order to identify racial profiling practices, have not been implemented.[38]

26. Joint Submission 1 (JS1) stated that same-sex couples have a right to marry but that it was not possible for such marriage to take place in the church. JS1 indicated that it awaited new regulation within the Lutheran church, in which the majority of the population were members.[39]

27. With regard to transgender persons, JS1 noted the requirement for applicable persons to undergo a complete castration in order to obtain the correct legal gender. It called for a model where the affected persons decided on the nature and scope of the treatment they wished to undergo, without such treatment having implications on the correction of their gender.[40]

2. Right to life, liberty and security of the person

28. Council of Europe - Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings (CoE-GRETA) stated that Section 224 of the Norwegian Criminal Code which related to human trafficking was not in conformity with the definition of trafficking in human beings in the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings. This Section 224 did not cover slavery or practices similar to slavery and servitude.[41]

29. CoE- GRETA stated that there was a need for further investment in the continuous training and awareness raising of relevant professionals, in particular prosecutors, judges, border police, immigration officials, labour inspectors, social workers and members of NGOs who were likely to come into contact with victims of trafficking.[42]

30. CoE-GRETA stated that Norway should strengthen its efforts to provide assistance to victims of trafficking. Also, such assistance should include the provision of: (a) safe and suitable temporary accommodation adapted to the needs and gender of victims; (b) information for victims on available services and assistance; and (c) access to education, vocational training and the labour market.[43]

31. NGOFHR stated unaccompanied minors between the ages of 15 and 18 years living in asylum centres under the care of the immigration authorities, are vulnerable to exploitation and trafficking. In 2012, 85 unaccompanied minors of this age group went missing from asylum centres.[44] NGOFHR recommended that Norway ensure that all children who are identified as victims of trafficking are placed under the care and assistance of the Child Welfare Services.[45]

32. CoE-GRETA stated that Norway should: (a) adapt its system to provide specifically tailored assistance to meet the needs of child victims of human trafficking; (b) strengthen co-operation between child protection services, outreach services, police and immigration authorities so that child victims of trafficking receive adequate care, taking into consideration their individual needs and best interests; (c) ensure that child victims of trafficking aged 15 to 18 are placed under the care and assistance of child welfare services; and (d) ensure that an individual risk assessment is carried out before returning child victims to their country of origin.[46]

33. CoE-GRETA stated that Norway should strengthen efforts to: (a) resolve difficulties arising from the lack of identity documents of victims of trafficking;[47] (b) guarantee victims access to compensation;[48] (c) ensure that crimes related to trafficking of human beings for all types of exploitation are investigated and prosecuted promptly and effectively;[49] and (d) ensure that victims are adequately informed, protected and assisted during the pre-trial and court proceedings.[50]

34. NGOFHR stated that Norway has 10 Children's Advocate Centres which provide for police or judicial interviews, medical investigations and psychological support for children. As evident from the 2012 annual report from these Centres, the time it took for the filing of a police report to a judicial or police interview varied from 42 days to 123 days; a considerable deviation from the statutory period of 14 days.[51] NGOFHR recommended inter alia effective procedures to strengthen the due process of law for children who are alleged victims of violence or sexual abuse by ensuring that they are interviewed within the statutory deadline.[52]

35. Joint Submission 2 (JS2) stated that Norway had partially implemented recommendation 23 relating to rape and domestic violence, made at the Review in 2009.[53]

36. NI noted that a national action plan was launched in August 2013 to prevent violence against women, including domestic violence, and recommended the allocation of sufficient funds for its implementation.[54] It also recommended establishing a national commission of experts to look into serious cases of domestic violence.[55] The Ombud made a similar recommendation.[56]

37. JS2 stated that the number of reported rape cases were low, whilst the number of cases dismissed or resulting in an acquittal was high; attributable inter alia to prejudices of jury members. JS2 called for training of professional judges and lay judges (making up the jury).[57]

38. NGOFHR stated that there was a lack of expertise and prioritisation to address gender-based violence within the public support and health care services, the police, the prosecuting authorities and the courts.[58] It recommended inter alia developing a comprehensive national prevention strategy and awareness raising campaign that addresses gender stereotypes and prejudice; adopting a legal definition of rape and other forms of sexual violence as sexual conduct in any instance in which the consent of the victim is not truly and freely given; and ensuring appropriate education and training of judges, members of the jury and other key actors in the legal system in order to evade any discriminatory attitudes that might affect women's rights to fair trial.[59]

39. NI stated that most children were placed in ordinary prisons with adults and were subjected to the same conditions as adults. New regulations that were meant to improve the situation were adopted in 2012, but were yet to enter into force. NI expressed concern about the lack of will in this regard.[60]

40. Council of Europe – European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CoE-CPT) expressed concern that in all the police establishments visited, a considerable number of persons remanded in custody were kept in police detention facilities beyond the 48-hour time limit, due to lack of capacity in remand prisons. These police establishments were unsuitable for accommodating detained persons for prolonged periods.[61] NI recommended ending the practice of placing arrested persons in police holding cells, and immediate action to end the practice of exceeding the 48 hour-limit.[62]

41. CoE-CPT stated that in the Police Immigration Detention Centre at Trandum in which foreign nationals were detained, there were no board games and hardly any reading materials.[63] The CoE-CPT expressed concern by the almost total lack of medical screening of newly arrived foreign nationals and the lack of nursing cover at the Centre.[64]

42. CoE-CPT stated that most of the cells at Bredtveit, Ila and Oslo Prisons did not have in-cell sanitation, and several prisoners complained about delays in gaining access to the toilet at night time. The CPT recommended that steps be taken to ensure that prisoners who need to use a toilet facility are able to do so without undue delay, including at night.[65]

43. NGOFHR stated that placement in police cells resulted in solitary confinement by default for all detainees, without consideration of the need for solitary confinement in individual cases. It recommended a thorough review of the legislative framework, practice, as well as control and review mechanisms to limit the use of solitary confinement to exceptional circumstances only.[66]

44. CoE-CPT expressed concern that some prisoners were subjected to solitary confinement for prolonged periods. It stated that the Criminal Procedure Act should stipulate an upper limit on the duration of solitary confinement.[67] Also, prisoners in solitary confinement should be visited on a daily basis by a doctor or a qualified nurse reporting to a doctor.[68]

45. CoE-CPT expressed concern that prisoners facing disciplinary charges were in most cases not interviewed by the person who decided on the imposition of a disciplinary sanction. It recommended that steps be taken to ensure that prisoners facing disciplinary charges are always heard in person by the decision-making authority.[69]

46. The Ombud noted that Norway criminalised the purchase of sexual activities in 2009, and recommended the establishment of holistic and coordinated programmes for persons vulnerable for being recruited into prostitution, and viable options to prostitution. Furthermore, necessary steps should be taken to ensure that trafficked women and girls have access to the protection and services they need, regardless of their availability or willingness to testify against their traffickers.[70]

3. Administration of justice

47. NGOFHR stated that the legal aid scheme was insufficient to ensure that all citizens enjoy access to justice and fair trials in cases involving civil matters. Many people were excluded from the legal aid scheme, even for cases involving housing, discrimination, debt, social security, claims for unpaid wages, prison law, and most areas of immigration law.[71]

48. The Council of Europe – European Committee of Social Rights (CoE- ECSR) concluded that prison sentences for minors may be as high as 21 years, and requested to know about a new sanction called "Juvenile Sentence".[72]

49. CoE-CPT expressed concern over provisions in the Circular of the General Prosecutor which provide that if the person is arrested after 10 p.m., contact with a lawyer may be postponed until the following morning. It recommended that the authorities take the necessary steps to ensure that the right of access to a lawyer is granted in all cases from the outset of the deprivation of liberty and that the aforementioned Circular is amended accordingly.[73] It also recommended that those unable to afford a lawyer be granted access to a lawyer immediately upon being taken into police custody;[74] that persons incapable of taking care of themselves receive the necessary medical attention;[75] and that persons apprehended by the police should immediately be verbally informed of their rights.[76]

4. Right to marriage and family life

50. NI stated that foreigners who married Norwegian citizens were dependent on their spouses for resident permits. A spouse will only be granted a separate residence permit after three years of marriage, with the exception of cases of domestic violence. However, the Authorities lacked the competence to assess cases of gender-based violence in resident permit applications.[77] The Ombud recommended modification of the three-year requirement for a separate residence permit.[78]

5. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

51. NI stated that there was a wage-gap based on gender inequality and recommended the further strengthening of measures to ensure that women and men receive equal pay for work of equal value.[79]

52. CoE-ECSR noted that the total working hours should not exceed 13 hours per day. However, in the case of Norway, the relevant legislation provides that total working hours in a 24 hour period may, in certain cases, go up to sixteen hours.[80]

6. Right to social security and to an adequate standard of living

53. SCN stated that the support received by families with children varied significantly from municipality to municipality. It recommended that Norway ensure: (a) that social benefit rates for families were equal across all municipalities; and (b) universal minimum standard for family income support above the national poverty line.[81]

54. NI stated that while most Norwegians enjoy adequate housing conditions, a substantial number of people were disadvantaged in the housing sector. NI recommended intensifying efforts to ensure affordable and adequate housing to disadvantaged persons with low income, in particular by ensuring an adequate supply of social housing units and by considering a legally enforceable right to permanent housing. NI also called for immediate measures to ensure that emergency shelters and social housing units meet an adequate standard, especially for families with children.[82]

55. CoE-ECSR recalled that the right to housing must not be subject to any kind of discrimination and concluded that there was discrimination against migrant workers in the Norwegian housing market.[83]

7. Right to health

56. JS 1 stated that there was only one centre that legally offered treatment to transgender people, including hormonal and surgical treatment. This denied transgender people the opportunity of getting a second opinion.[84]

57. NGOFHR stated that there was widespread use of coercive interventions in psychiatric institutions, which included detention, seclusion, use of restraints and involuntary medication.[85] It recommended that Norway inter alia introduce clear and detailed regulations on the use of coercive interventions in psychiatric institutions in full compliance with international human rights standards.[86]

58. NI stated that there was inadequate staffing for local health services which played a vital role in fulfilling the rights to health for children and young people.[87]

59. NI stated that in 2011 Norway introduced regulation limiting access to necessary health services to persons without legal status. As a consequence, these persons were being turned away from public hospitals and health centres. It recommended that Norway ensure access to adequate health care services for irregular migrants.[88]

8. Right to education

60. NI stated that children's rights to education were repeatedly violated in some municipalities, with no consequences for the municipal educational authorities. It recommended introducing sanctions for those that failed to comply with the provisions of the Educational Act.[89]

61. SCN stated that while the Kinder Garden Act gave all children the right to attend kinder garden, it did not confer such right on children living in reception centres, irrespective of their immigration status. Also, asylum-seeking children above the age of 16 years did not have the right to secondary education.[90]

62. Catholic International Education Office (OIEC) called for an increase in subsidies to private schools. It also stated that all students with special needs attending private schools should receive assistance similar to that given to students attending public schools.[91]

63. NI stated that the high level of absenteeism among Roma children was reason for concern. NI recommended that Norway introduce an action plan to ensure the right to education for Roma children.[92]

64. CoE-AC recommended that Norway: (a) continue and to intensify the measures taken to remedy the difficulties encountered by Roma and Romani/Taters children in the education system; and (b) find solutions suited to the particular lifestyle of Roma and Romani/Taters children in order to grant them equality in access to quality education while preserving their culture.[93]

65. JS2 stated that sexual education was not obligatory and was dependent on the school and pupils. The school curricular included a small selection of competency objectives in

which themes related to sexuality were embedded. This was insufficient to guarantee comprehensive sexual education.[94]

9. Cultural rights.

66. CoE-AC recommended that Norway: (a) take appropriate measures to effectively support the cultures of persons belonging to national minorities, in particular by preserving their languages; and (b) give more attention to the needs expressed by persons belonging to national minorities in order to promote their historical image as well as contemporary aspects of their identities including culture and languages.[95]

67. Norske Kveners Forbund/Ruijan Kveeniliitto (NKF) called for a rise in the level of the Kven language from level II to III, in accordance with the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages.[96]

68. NKF stated that some Kven cultural objects and buildings were in the process of being registered as that of Sami and in this regard, called for the establishment of a joint Norwegian, Sami and Kven committee on cultural heritage.[97]

10. Persons with disabilities

69. WSO stated that there were several areas in which persons with psychological and other disabilities were systematically discriminated against in legislation and in practice.[98] It recommended that Norway undertake legislative reform and repeal discriminatory legislation that authorises deprivation of liberty linked in legislation to "mental disorder", psychological or intellectual disability, or in other ways being based on disability. It also recommended that Norway incorporate into law the abolition of discrimination and coercive practices against children and adults with disabilities in medical settings, including forced and non-consensual administration of neuroleptic drugs and electroshock, which are recognised as forms of torture or ill-treatment.[99]

70. The Ombud recommended the establishment of hate crime against disabled people as an explicit category in the national system for registration of such crimes.[100]

11. Minorities and indigenous peoples

71. CoE-AC recommended that Norway persevere with its dialogue-based approach to sustain effective participation by representatives of the national minorities in all decision-making processes affecting them and ensure coordination between all state authorities and the national minorities concerned.[101]

72. NI expressed concern that the current political debates in Norway had little focus on the Roma's entitlement to respect for human rights, and instead concentrated on measures to criminalise their activities.[102]

73. Selvhjelp for innvandrere og flyktninger (SEIF) stated that the action plan to improve the living conditions for the Roma community in Oslo, launched in 2009, failed to address fundamental issues such as illiteracy, school attendance, arranged marriages involving minors, and the status of Roma women within family and community structures.[103]

74. SIEF stated that an increased number of Roma families have lost custody of their children. The gravity of some of those cases has led the Norwegian Child Protection Offices to implement extreme measures, such as granting parents limited visitation rights with their children, and in some cases no visitation rights at all. In cases where visitation rights have been granted, the children and their parents were not allowed to speak Romanés to each other. Roma children living with Norwegian foster families were deprived of their right to receive education on Roma culture and language. Many young Roma women also feared getting pregnant or giving birth in Norway as they feared that Child Protection Services will take their children away.[104]

75. The CoE-AC recommended that Norway: (a) take measures to improve the situation of persons belonging to the Roma and Romani/Taters minorities during their seasonal travel; (b) ensure that all forms of discrimination against persons belonging to the Roma and Romani/Taters minorities in the provision of services be firmly opposed. Discriminatory attitudes from the police must also be effectively and appropriately sanctioned; and (c) ensure that the policies and programmes intended to improve the situation of Roma and Romani/Taters were implemented effectively in close consultation with the persons concerned.[105]

76. The CoE-AC recommended that Norway (a) emphasise in its police training the specificity of the traditional lifestyle of the Roma and Romani/Taters communities as an essential component of their cultural identity and promote the recruitment of persons with a Roma background into the police force; and (b) ensure that Roma and Romani/Taters are not denied access to commercial camping sites on arbitrary grounds.[106]

77. The CoE-AC recommended that Norway ensure the security of all persons belonging to national minorities especially in and around their places of worship in consultation with representatives of those groups.[107]

78. The CoE-AC recommended that Norway take measures to enable persons belonging to the Roma and Romani/Taters minorities who have been victims of the forced assimilation policy to be identified in accordance with their own particular cultural origin.[108]

79. NI expressed concern over the lack of information in school curricula on the assimilation policy with regard to the Sami and the movement fighting for Sami rights. It recommended that Norway involve the Sami in reviewing all teaching materials.[109]

80. The Saami Council (SC) stated that although reindeer herding and other traditional Sami livelihoods formally result in property rights to land, these rights were ignored in the Norwegian Mining Act.[110] Also, the mineral policy adopted in 2013 did not contain any concrete proposals on the survival of the Sami traditional livelihoods in a mining environment.[111] It made recommendations including revision of the Mining Act to reflect inter alia the property rights of the Sami over their traditional lands and the adoption of a new mining policy.[112]

81. SC stated that securing the right of the Sea Sami to fish was necessary for the survival of their culture.[113] The Norwegian Parliament adopted a policy for fishing in the Sea Sami territories that denied Sea Sami local communities rights to their traditional territories.[114]

82. SC stated that the mandate of the Sami parliament, established primarily as a body through which the Sami people could exercise its right to self-determination, was severely restricted, reducing it to an advisory body.[115]

12. Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers

83. LNU welcomed the amendment of the Immigration Act providing for unaccompanied asylum-seeking minors the right to a representative, in accordance with recommendation 106.40 made at the Review in 2009.[116]

84. NI expressed concern by the serious and harmful effects of the temporary residence permits given to unaccompanied asylum seeking minors between the ages of 16 and 18 years and the uncertainty it brought to those young people.[117]

85. LNU stated that unaccompanied asylum-seeking children between the ages of 15 and 18 were subjected to discrimination in so far as they are not given the same rights to care as other children, pursuant to the Child Welfare Act.[118] It recommended that Norway place the responsibility for all unaccompanied minor asylum seekers up to the age of 18 years with the Child Welfare Services.[119]

86. NGOFHR stated the best interests of the child should be considered in all immigration matters. It recommended specifying in the relevant regulation how these interests should be interpreted.[120]

87 JS1 stated that it has become increasingly difficult for asylum seekers to prove their sexual orientation following the ruling of the Norwegian Supreme Court that LGBT asylum seekers should not be sent to their home country if they would be required to hide their sexual orientation to avoid persecution, and the introduction of new regulations in The Norwegian Directory of Immigration. It called for a review of the existing practices.[121]

Notes

[1] The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org

Civil society

Joint submissions

JS1	The Norwegian LGBT Association, Oslo, Norway and ILGA Europe Joint (Joint Submission 1);
JS2	Sex og Politikk and Sexual Rights Initiative, (Joint Submission 2);
NGOFHR	Norwegian NGO-forum for Human Rights on behalf of: Amnesty International Norway, FIAN Norway, FOKUS – Forum for Women and Development, The Human Rights Committee of the Norwegian Bar Association The Human Rights Committee of the Norwegian Psychologist Association, International Commission of Jurists, Norwegian Section, Human Rights House Foundation, Juss-Buss - Law Students' Legal Aid Centre, Legal Advice for Women (JURK), The Norwegian Centre against Racism, The Norwegian Helsinki Committee The Norwegian National Committee for UNICEF, PLAN Norway, Save the Children Norway; Oslo; Norway.

Individual submissions

AI	Amnesty International, London (UK);
FIOH	The Future in Our Hands, Oslo, Norway;
LNU	The Norwegian Children and Youth Council, Oslo, Norway;
NKF	Norske Kveners Forbund/Ruijan Kveeniliitto, Tromsø, Norway;
SC	Saami Council, Ohcejohka, Finland;
SCN	Save the Children – Norway, Oslo, Norway;
SEIF	Selvhjelp for innvandrere og flyktninger, Oslo, Norway;
STP	Society for Threatened People;
WSO	We Shall Overcome, Oslo, Norway;

National human rights institution

NI	Norwegian Centre for Human Rights, jointly with the Parliamentary Ombudsman for Public Administration, the Equality and Anti-discrimination Ombud, and the Ombudsman for Children, Oslo, Norway;
Ombud	The Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud, Oslo, Norway;

Regional intergovernmental organization

CoE	The Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France);
CoE-CPT	Council of Europe – European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment , Report to the Norwegian Government on the visit to Norway carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment from 18 to 27 May 2011, CPT/Inf (2011) 33;
CoE-ECRI	Council of Europe - European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, ECRI Conclusions on the Implementation of the Recommendations in Respect of Norway subject to Interim Follow-Up, CRI(2012)9, Adopted on 9 December 2011;
OSCE-ODIHR	Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe - Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, Warsaw, Poland;
CoE-AC	Council of Europe – Advisory Committee on the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities, Third Opinion on Norway, adopted on 30 June 2011, ACFC/OP/III(2011)007, Strasbourg, France;
CoE-GRETA	Council of Europe - Group of Experts on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings, Report concerning the implementation of the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings by Norway, GRETA (2013) 5, Strasbourg, France;

CoE-ECSR Council of Europe – European Committee of Social Rights, Conclusions, 2010 (Norway), December 2010; Conclusions 2011.

[2] Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, Norway, A/HRC/13/5.
[3] LNU, p. 1, paras. 4 and 5. See also NGOFHR, p. 3, para. 5; NI, p. 2, WSO, p. 2.
[4] NI, p. 2.
[5] WSO, p. 6.
[6] LNU, p. 1, paras. 1-3; NGOFHR, p. 3, para. 5; and SCN, para. 3. See also NI p. 2.
[7] NGOFHR, p. 3, para. 5. See also NI, p. 2.
[8] LNU, p. 1, paras. 6 and 7.
[9] NGOFHR, p. 4, para. 7.
[10] NI, p. 2.
[11] NI, p. 2.
[12] Ombud, p. 1.
[13] NI, p. 3.
[14] WSO, p. 2.
[15] Ombud, p. 1.
[16] OSCE-ODIHR, p. 4, referring to the Joint Opinion on the Electoral Legislation of Norway (Opinion-Nr.: 587/2010, issued jointly by ODIHR and the Venice Commission on 22 December 2010.).
[17] SCN, paras. 4 – 7.
[18] Ombud, p. 2.
[19] NGOFHR, p. 5, para. 16.) NI made a similar recommendation (NI, p. 3.).
[20] NI, p. 69.
[21] Ombud, p. 2.
[22] CoE-AC, pp. 11-12, paras. 46 and 47.
[23] FIOH, para. 8.
[24] NGOFHR, p. 4, paras. 8 – 12. NGOFHR made a recommendation (p. 4, para. 13.).
[25] NI, p. 3.
[26] NGOFHR, p. 6, para. 23.
[27] NI, p. 3.
[28] NI, pp. 4-5. See also Ombud, p. 6.
[29] Ombud, p. 1.
[30] Ombud, p. 3.
[31] Ombud, p. 3.
[32] NI, p. 4.
[33] European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, ECRI Report on Norway (fourth monitoring Cycle), Adopted on 20 June 2008, Published on 24 February 2009, p. 16, para. 27.
[34] European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, ECRI Report on Norway (fourth monitoring Cycle), Adopted on 20 June 2008, Published on 24 February 2009, p. 19, para. 42.
[35] CoE-ECRI, p. 5.
[36] (CoE-ECRI, p. 6.)
[37] European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, ECRI Report on Norway (fourth monitoring Cycle), Adopted on 20 June 2008, Published on 24 February 2009, p. 40, para.145.
[38] CoE-ECRI, p. 7.
[39] JS1, para. 4.
[40] JS1, para. 7.
[41] CoE-GRETA, p. 64, para. 21.
[42] CoE-GRETA, p. 22, para. 73.
[43] CoE-GRETA, p. 38, para. 164.
[44] NGOFHR, p. 11, para. 53. See also SCN, para. 12.
[45] NGOFHR, p. 11, para. 54. See also SCN, para. 13.
[46] CoE-GRETA, p. 40, para. 176. See also SCN, para. 13.
[47] CoE-GRETA, p. 44, para. 206.
[48] CoE-GRETA, p. 46, para. 214.
[49] CoE-GRETA, p. 54, para. 260.
[50] CoE-GRETA, p. 55, para. 266.
[51] NGOFHR, p. 11, paras. 50 and 51. See also NI, p. 7; SCN, para. 17.

[52] NGOFHR, p. 11, para. 52. SCN made recommendations (para. 18).
[53] JS2, p. 8, para. 24.
[54] NI, p. 6.
[55] NI, p. 7.
[56] Ombud, p. 4.
[57] JS 2, p. 6, para. 19.
[58] NGOFHR, p. 9, para. 45.
[59] NGOFHR, p. 10, para. 49. See also the Ombud, p. 4.
[60] NI, p. 6.
[61] CoE-CPT, p. 11, para. 8.
[62] NI, p. 5. NGOFHR made a similar recommendation. (p. 7, para.26.).
[63] CoE-CPT, p. 18, para. 31. See also NGOFHR, p. 8, paras. 35 – 38.
[64] CoE-CPT, p. 18, para. 33.
[65] CoE-CPT, p. 23, para. 48.
[66] NI, p. 5.
[67] CoE-CPT, p. 31, para. 74.
[68] CoE-CPT, p. 32, para. 77.
[69] CoE-CPT, p. 32, para. 79.
[70] Ombud, pp. 6-7.
[71] NGOFHR, p. 12, para. 58. NGOFHR made recommendations (p. 12, para. 59).
[72] CoE-ECSR, (2011) p. 15.
[73] CoE-CPT, p. 13, para. 13.
[74] CoE-CPT, p. 13, para. 14.
[75] CoE-CPT, p. 13, para. 16.
[76] CoE-CPT, p. 14, para. 17.
[77] NI, p. 12.
[78] Ombud, p. 8.
[79] NI, p. 8.
[80] CoE-ECSR, (2010) p. 6.
[81] SCN, para. 22.
[82] NI, p. 8.
[83] CoE-ECSR, (2011) p. 29.
[84] JS1, para. 8.
[85] NGOFHR, p. 9, paras. 39 – 43. See also NI, p. 9.
[86] NGOFHR, p. 9, para. 44. See also NI, p. 10; Ombud, p. 5.
[87] NI, p. 9. NI made a recommendation (p. 9).
[88] NI, p. 8.
[89] NI, p. 7.
[90] SCN, paras. 27 and 28.
[91] OIEC, p. 3.
[92] NI, p. 9.
[93] CoE-AC, p. 20, paras. 104 and 105.
[94] JS2, p. 7, paras. 22 and 23.
[95] CoE-AC, p. 14, paras. 63 and 64.
[96] NKF, p. 2, para. 8.
[97] NKF, p. 2, para. 10.
[98] WSO, p. 3.
[99] WSO, p. 4.
[100] Ombud, p. 5.
[101] CoE-AC, p. 22, para. 122.
[102] NI, p. 10. NI made recommendations (p. 11.).
[103] SIEF, p. 2.
[104] SIEF, p. 3. SIEF made recommendations (p. 4).
[105] CoE-AC, p. 12, paras. 51 – 53.
[106] CoE-AC, p. 16, paras. 74 and 75.
[107] CoE-AC, p. 16, para. 76.

[108] CoE-AC, p. 16, para. 80.
[109] NI, p. 10. See also SC, p. 5, para. 3(12).
[110] SC, p. 2, para. 2.2.
[111] SC, p. para. 2.4. See also STP, p. 2.
[112] SC, p. 5.
[113] SC, p. 4, para. 2.8.
[114] SC, p. 4, para. 2.9. SC made recommendations (p. 5). See also STP, p. 2.
[115] SC, p. 4, para. 2.10.
[116] LNU, p. 2, para. 9.
[117] NI, p. 11. NI made a recommendation (p. 11).
[118] LNU, p. 2, para. 9.
[119] LNU, p. 2, para. 10. See also NGOFHR, p. 13, para. 64; SCN, para. 32.
[120] NGOFHR, p. 14, paras. 66, 67. See also NI, p. 11; SCN, para. 26.
[121] JS1, para. 5.